



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 7450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,954	04/24/2001	John Zhu	50P4401.01	5639
36738	7590	09/16/2005	EXAMINER	
ROGITZ & ASSOCIATES 750 B STREET SUITE 3120 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/840,954

Applicant(s)

ZHU ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin E Lanier

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12-20 and 22-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12-20 and 22-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on 13 June 2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "messages from a client device at a local link terminal" in lines 12-13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims previously mention having a first and second link terminal providing data streams to the client device and having plural client devices transmitting IP packets to plural link terminals, but the

Art Unit: 2132

claims do not recite messages being sent from a client device to a local link terminal. It is also unclear if the local link terminal is intended to be one of the plural link terminals mentioned in claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen, U.S. Patent No. 6,065,120, in view of Ala-Laurila, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,680.

Referring to claim 1, Laursen discloses mobile authentication system wherein a plurality of mobile client devices are in communication with a plurality of servers over a wireless network (Figure 1 & Col. 6, lines 5-18). The servers can be either host servers or link servers (Col. 13, lines 19-20), which meets the limitation of plural link terminals communicating with plural client devices. The host servers can be web servers that provide access to information stored thereon using HTTP protocols (Col. 6, lines 15-18), which meets the limitation of at least one network

Art Unit: 2132

operation center including at least one application component. To establish a secured communication between a client device and a server a mutual authentication process is conducted between the two (Col. 9, lines 33-35). First a session request packet is transmitted from the client device to the server (Col. 9, lines 55-64). The session request packet contains a session ID, a device ID, and an IP address (Col. 9, line 65 – Col. 10, line 18), which meets the limitation of receiving IP packets therefrom in respective sessions, at least some IP packets being associated with information, the information being unique to the session, the information including one session name. Once received at the server the session request is decrypted using an encryption key and a session key is generated (Col. 11, lines 9-15), which meets the limitation of each session being associated with a unique shared secret between a client device and a link terminal communicating therewith. When the server receives the session request, it strips the session ID and creates a new session ID (Col. 10, lines 1-4, 65-67 & Col. 11, lines 54-57), which meets the limitation of logic at a local link terminal for stripping the session name from messages from a client device. Laursen acknowledges the mobility of such wireless client devices but does not discuss how the network handles handover (Col. 1, lines 39-50). Ala-Laurila discloses an IP based wireless network that provides multiple access points, at different locations, to the client device to communicate (Col. 1, lines 34-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the link servers in Laursen's mobile authentication system to be located at different geographic locations in order to provide uninterrupted communications as taught in Ala-Laurila (Col. 1, lines 48-54).

Referring to claim 2, Laursen discloses that link server is coupled to a database (Figure 2B), which meets the limitation of a respective data center incorporating each link terminal.

Referring to claims 3, 29, Laursen discloses that once received at the server the session request is decrypted using an encryption key and a session key is generated (Col. 11, lines 9-15), which meets the limitation of logic at at least one local link terminal for generating the shared secret.

Referring to claims 4, 29, Laursen discloses that the link server generates the session ID (Col. 10, lines 63-67).

Referring to claim 5, Laursen discloses that there is a host server coupled to the link server and database (Figure 2B).

Referring to claim 8, Laursen discloses that the wireless client devices have an antenna and IP transceiver (Figure 1).

Referring to claim 9, Laursen discloses that the communication network uses schemes such as CDMA and TDMA (Col. 6, lines 2-3), which would meet the limitation of data transmission rate in excess of one megabyte per second.

8. Claims 7, 10, 12-20, 22-25, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen, in view of Ali-Laurila, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Bayeh, U.S. Patent No. 6,098,093 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rautila, U.S. Patent No. 6,549,625. Referring to claims 7, 10, 13, 16, 18, 23, 24, Laursen discloses mobile authentication system wherein a plurality of mobile client devices are in communication with a plurality of servers over a wireless network (Figure 1 & Col. 6, lines 5-18). The servers can be either host servers or link servers (Col. 13, lines 19-20), which meets the limitation of plural link terminals communicating with plural client devices. The host servers can be web servers that provide access to information stored thereon using HTTP protocols (Col. 6, lines 15-18), which meets the

Art Unit: 2132

limitation of at least one network operation center including at least one application component.

To establish a secured communication between a client device and a server a mutual authentication process is conducted between the two (Col. 9, lines 33-35). First a session request packet is transmitted from the client device to the server (Col. 9, lines 55-64). The session request packet contains a session ID, a device ID, and an IP address (Col. 9, line 65 – Col. 10, line 18), which meets the limitation of receiving IP packets therefrom in respective sessions, at least some IP packets being associated with information, the information being unique to the session, the information including one session name. Once received at the server the session request is decrypted using an encryption key and a session key is generated (Col. 11, lines 9-15), which meets the limitation of each session being associated with a unique shared secret between a client device and a link terminal communicating therewith. When the server receives the session request, it strips the session ID and creates a new session ID (Col. 10, lines 1-4, 65-67 & Col. 11, lines 54-57), which meets the limitation of logic at a local link terminal for stripping the session name from messages from a client device. Ala-Laurila discloses an IP based wireless network that provides multiple access points, at different locations, to the client device to communicate (Col. 1, lines 34-55). Laursen does not disclose location-based services being provided by the system. Rautila discloses a wireless communication system wherein location based services are provided to a wireless terminal or device (Col. 2, lines 13-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide location based services in the wireless network of Laursen in order to provide subscribers with important information about their current location as taught in Rautila (Col. 1, line 34-65).

Referring to claims 12, 22, Laursen discloses that the communication network uses schemes such as CDMA and TDMA (Col. 6, lines 2-3), which would meet the limitation of data transmission rate in excess of one megabyte per second.

Referring to claims 14, 19, 20, 25, 30, Laursen discloses that once received at the server the session request is decrypted using an encryption key and a session key is generated (Col. 11, lines 9-15), which meets the limitation of logic at at least one local link terminal for generating the shared secret. Laursen discloses that the link server generates the session ID (Col. 10, lines 63-67).

Referring to claim 15, Laursen discloses that when the server receives the session request, it strips the session ID and creates a new session ID (Col. 10, lines 1-4, 65-67 & Col. 11, lines 54-57), which meets the limitation of logic at a local link terminal for stripping the session name from messages from a client device.

Referring to claim 17, Laursen discloses that the wireless client devices have an antenna and IP transceiver (Figure 1).

9. Claims 26, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen, in view of Ali-Laurila, in view of Bayeh, U.S. Patent No. 6,098,093, in view of Rautila, U.S. Patent No. 6,549,625, as applied to claim 18, further in view of Ladue, U.S. Patent No. 6,070,070.

Referring to claims 26, 28, Laursen does not disclose using accounting procedures to bill the user for the amount of packets provided. Ladue discloses a cellular phone switching system wherein the billing information is measured by the amount of packets transmitted (Col. 25, line 66 - Col. 26, line 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the



Art Unit: 2132

invention was made to use the accounting procedures of Ladue in the IP based wireless network of Ali-Laurila in order to provide anti-fraud protection as taught in Ladue (Col. 26, lines 39-44).

10. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen, in view of Ali-Laurila, in view of Bayeh, U.S. Patent No. 6,098,093, as applied to claim 1, further in view of Ladue, U.S. Patent No. 6,070,070. Referring to claim 27, Laursen does not disclose using accounting procedures to bill the user for the amount of packets provided. Ladue discloses a cellular phone switching system wherein the billing information is measured by the amount of packets transmitted (Col. 25, line 66 - Col. 26, line 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the accounting procedures of Ladue in the IP based wireless network of Ali-Laurila in order to provide anti-fraud protection as taught in Ladue (Col. 26, lines 39-44).

### *Conclusion*

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E. Lanier whose telephone number is 571-272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30am-5:00pm, F 7:30am-4pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2132

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Benjamin E. Lanier



GILBERTO BARRON JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100